

REMARKS

Claims 9-12 are pending in this Office Action. The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Welly (U.S. Patent 5,480,527).

However, the Examiner stated that the objected to dependent claims 11 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 11 and 12 have been rewritten in independent form. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 11 and 12 are patentable over Welly and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claims 11 and 12.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 14, 2004

By: _____


George D. Medlock, Jr.
Registration No. 48,167